

Date: Tue, 16 Nov 93 04:30:09 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #456
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 16 Nov 93 Volume 93 : Issue 456

Today's Topics:

Look what I found!

Robert the Robot

THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas (2 msgs)

 This is a hobby not a career (was: 3rd
 Yet Another License Structure Proposal...

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1993 14:04:51 -0700
From: orca.es.com!cnn.sim.es.com!msanders.sim.es.com!user@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Look what I found!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Looks like Robert has just posted his IQ.

Milt

=====

"Sandman"

Date: 15 Nov 1993 01:28:10 -0600
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Robert the Robot
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (Robert WA3J) posts:

>paulf@csl.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>

> Now, Robert, step back for a moment, and ask yourself "is this any way to
> convince a no-code tech that Morse Code is a Good Thing?". Probably not.

>Most definitely not, Paul. But then again, learning Morse is beyond their
>capacity, so why try? It's sort of like trying to teach a pig to sing.
>It's a waste of time and only annoys the pig.

I have it figured out. This Robert WA3J thing is really a robot poster. It adapts the latest "fortune" or quote from somewhere else, and posts it as its own. No real person would keep coming up with these stale old quotes. I bet it sets up on DX frequencies and sends "up lid" every 15 seconds. Fortunately, Houston is the right distance from me so I don't hear it.

Maybe there is a real person behind it, well disguised. I vote we nominate him Elmer of the Year - or something... there are some funny people in Houston.

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1993 19:24:46 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CGGuK5.5KH@walter.bellcore.com> sohl,
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com writes:

>iCareful Rick, your touching another area that many hams want to
>retain as a filter...namely the cost of ham equipment. I've seen
>more than one comment about how "bad" it is that Radio Shack sells
>ham equipment. The claim is that too much ham gear will be bought
>and illegally used by non-hams from Radio Shack.

Yea! I have noticed that hams seem to think they need protection, when the reality is they protect themselves very nicely. When I bought my

radio I was unlicensed.....Did I use it.....NO. Why because If I had no one would have talked to me. I carried it programed for the repeaters in the area and if I had come across a life threatening accident I would have used it.....and payed the price later. I never had to put it to the test.

Rick

Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1993 20:24:01 GMT
From: unix.sri.com!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Cslipaulf@hplabs.hp.com
Subject: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

>Again, you are requiring a demonstration of a skill that (by your own
>admission) only just over half the active operators use. And at that,
>only AFTER they were FORCED to learn the skill. While no other amateur
>is tested on any mode the way we test for CW. And there is more than one
>mode that is more popular.

"Only" a majority? Look, we have to have some sort of measurable, objective criteria on which to base the exams. I claim that the best criteria is skill usage. The only mode on HF which is more popular is SSB, which doesn't really need an acquired skill (most folks can talk). Add to that the fact that the CW exam is weighted less than the written, and your latter comment doesn't wash.

In fact, turn it around. I wouldn't mind seeing another separate test for sideband or wideband mode operational practices. Right now, CW is the **only** operational practices exam we give. Rather than see that go, I'd like to see **additional** exams.

>But why require people to pass a code test to gain privlidges to non-code
>spectrum (Yes I know CW is leagle everywhere, but not necessarily the
>primary mode)? And how does that futher Amateur Radio.

Because, based on usage, the average ham **will** use CW, and moreover, this is a good thing, given scarcity of spectrum.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

Date: 15 Nov 93 21:27:22 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!linac!att!att-out!cbnewsj!k2ph@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: This is a hobby not a career (was: 3rd
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Date: 15 Nov 93 23:20:54 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!
jws@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Yet Another License Structure Proposal...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In Europe, countries are standardizing license classes so that automatic reciprocity is possible (the CEPT classifications).

If the US were to change class structures again, I'd vote for something that would be in line with the CEPT classes to make arranging for reciprocal licenses easy, if not automatic.

I'm not 100% sure, but I believe that this would be satisfied by the following structure:

Class B: All VHF/UHF amateur allocations
No code
Written exam same as current Technician (elements 2 & 3a)

Class A: All amateur allocations
5 or 10 wpm code (until requirement is dropped by ITU)
Written exam same as current General (or possibly including some of element 4a (Advanced)).

Why make it any more complicated or difficult than it needs to be? The U.S. has the most complex license structure in the world, and it hasn't done us any particular good. If it does change someday, let's follow the KISS principle (not to mention the lead of most of the rest of the world).

73,

John, NK0R

Date: (null)

From: (null)

What's wrong with "roger?" Why would you want to use either Q codes or 10 codes on phone?

--

Bob Schreibmaier K2PH | UUCP: ...!att!mtdcr!bob
AT&T Bell Laboratories | Internet: bob@mtdcr.att.com
Middletown, N.J. 07748 | ICBM: 40o21'N, 74o8'W

Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1993 06:57:36 GMT

From: sdd.hp.com!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!utnut!torn!nott!cunews!freenet.carleton.ca!
Freenet.carleton.ca!aj467@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rcrw90-121193085420@node_13059.aieg.mot.com>,
<rcrw90-111193161618@node_13059.aieg.mot.com>, <CGCG87.G0K@freenet.carlet
Reply-To : aj467@Freenet.carleton.ca (Bill Macpherson)
Subject : Re: CW

Well there were indeed a few things I forgot to mention in my synopsis of the presentation.

The antenna was a funtional component of the final reasonent circuit.

It was not coupled as a reactive load as the modern antenna is.

The spark Gap was across two paralel lines, which with an LRC circuit, were shunted by the antenna (ie it also was accross the two potential lines) The whole concept was likely the father of the rotary spark gap, the expense of engineering the large condensors, coils, resitors and generators would have fallen outside the realm of an amateur (both in terms of cost and scale) as the spark generator was as high as a man, and the frequency was determined by the shaft RPM.

I think Dr Belrose is on his way to New York to present the entire program to Engineers (IEEE) or some similar group. Have a good one this week.

Got your old call ... will scope out the club, any old buddies to say hello to ??

73 ... Bill

--

Bill VE3NJW Advanced Amateur
Packet Address : VE3NJW@VE3KYT.#EON.ON.CAN
Freenet Address: aj467@Freenet.Carleton.ca

Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1993 20:34:08 GMT
From: unix.sri.com!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@hplabs.hp.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov11.043039.26340@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<1993Nov11.181344.26812@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Nov13.155459.7471@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In some cultures the counting system goes 1,2,3,many. :-)

"Five is right out!" ;-)

>I'd consider 10% of the ham population many. That's 60,000 people.
>Even 1% represents 6,000 operators. According to the ARRL survey,
>38% of amateurs have used Morse in the last year. Where do you start
>drawing the line for many? Is it at 37.99999%? You don't seem to have
>a problem with allowing 1% or 10% of amateurs to operate without a mode
>specific test. How many more than 10% will you accept without a mode
>specific Morse test?

First of all, that's 38% of ALL amateurs, including codeless techs. Since we're discussing HF usage only, it's fair to say that the 38% figure is low, by some factor between 1 and 2. In any event, I'd say a reasonable usage minimum would be 1 in 3, or 33%. Again, we're trying to test for skills and knowledge that one is *likely* to use, and $P > 0.9$ that one is *not* likely to use something is pretty damning.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1993 20:14:35 GMT
From: unix.sri.com!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@hplabs.hp.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931108.66748.EDELLERS@delphi.com>,
<DRT.93Nov12103657@cacciatore.mit.edu>,
<rcrw90-121193125906@node_13059.aieg.mot.com>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

>This assumes that manually sent and received CW is and will always remain
>superior to any other mode. With certain exceptions this is no longer
>>true. SITOR/AMTOR for example have very nearly the same bandwidth, and
>power requirements of CW, but with gauranteed zero errors!

Woops, not quite. SITOR/AMTOR has an occupied bandwidth of about 500 Hz, or
5x that of a fast CW signal. In addition, the error control system is rather
poor -- it's essentially a parity - retransmission scheme, with a fairly
high overhead. Errors in AMTOR copy are pretty common.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #456

